

**Minutes of the SC Commission on Higher Education  
Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Public Agenda  
November 3, 2016  
9:30 a.m.**

Subcommittee Members Attendance

Ms. Allison Dean Love, Chair  
Mr. Devron Edwards (phone)  
Dr. Jennifer Settlemyer  
Mr. Mike LeFever  
Dr. Louis Lynn  
Adm. Charles Munns  
Mr. Ken Kirkland  
Mr. Paul Batson

Staff Attendance

Dr. Argentini Anderson  
Mr. Clay Barton  
Ms. Carrie Eberly  
Mr. Gary Glenn  
Ms. Trena Houpp  
Dr. John Lane  
Dr. Tom Layzell  
Dr. Rich Rhoda  
Ms. Tanya Rogers  
Ms. Peggy Simon  
Dr. Karen Woodfaulk

Additional Attendance

Mr. Tim Hofferth, Chair, SC Commission on  
Higher Education  
Ms. Melanie Barton, Education Oversight Committee

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

Chair Love called the meeting to order at 9:37 a.m. After welcoming everyone, she asked all in attendance to introduce themselves.

A **motion** was made (Munns), **seconded** (Settlemyer) and **carried** to approve the minutes of the October 4, 2016 Ad Hoc Subcommittee Public Agenda meeting.

**2. Chair's Report**

Chair Love shared with the subcommittee a quote of the day regarding the purpose and importance of the public agenda, expressing that it is vital for the state of South Carolina and its citizens, taxpayers, students and colleges. She reported that college presidents had met the previous Monday and they conveyed full support of the intent of the public agenda. She said that collaboration is key and that the public agenda is focused on economic development, jobs, and on quality of life. She mentioned the overlapping purpose of the Workforce Development Coordinating Council on which Interim Executive Director, Gary Glenn, serves. She then shared the General Assembly's mission for the Commission on Higher Education, noting that the public agenda's focus is synonymous with the mission of the CHE. In response to a question asking when the public agenda is expected to be completed, Chair Love stated that Chairman Hofferth would like it to be completed by June 2017.

Chair Love reported on informal contacts with key stakeholders. She has reached out to Ms. Molly Spearman, the State Superintendent of Education, and also spoke with Mr. Ted Pitts about the business community and the projections of workforce needs versus current supply. He

has offered to assist with the process. She has also reached out to Ms. Cheryl Stanton, with the SC Department of Employment Workforce, and Mr. Bobby Hitt, SC Department of Commerce.

After an introduction by Chair Love, Ms. Melanie Barton shared with the subcommittee the charge of the Education Oversight Committee (EOC), which is development of the accountability system for K-12 education. Currently, the EOC is working on merging the state and federal accountability systems to satisfy new [Every Student Succeeds Act](#) requirements (ESSA). She explained that the state must ensure every student who graduates from a SC public high school meets [The Profile of the South Carolina Graduate](#), a set of new criteria passed into law in the last session. The goal of K-12 is college and career readiness at both the state and federal levels. She shared with the subcommittee that there will be shortages in numerous industries if there are no changes in the secondary-to-postsecondary-to-workforce pipeline. Moreover, the achievement gap between Hispanic and African-American students has to be addressed because they will soon be the majority in the state because of the growing minority representation. She explained that students are also lacking in soft skills. She said, in the end, South Carolina does not have an education “system”; instead the state has education silos: birth-K and K-12. She also expressed that there are too many students who need remediation before entering college. In conclusion, the EOC needs to raise the rigor; if the pipeline is not improved, all of South Carolina will lose.

After extensive discussion, in response to the question, “What will be done with the numbers from the public agenda?”, Ms. Barton answered that the state will hold the districts accountable across the state.

### **3. Discussion of Baseline Document and Next Steps**

Chair Love introduced Dr. Layzell, who shared with the subcommittee that “these documents are not self-executing,” but that the Higher Education Study Committee (HESC) report will act as a foundation. The idea is to update the current HESC report and edit it so that the final document is succinct and clear. It is expected that a draft document will be ready for review by the subcommittee by the first of the new calendar year. The educational attainment goal is central to this process. Degree production needs to be aligned with forecasts of what the economy needs.

In response to the question, “Is the cluster analysis from the 2009 study still valid in 2016/17?”, Ms. Barton answered that she believes the information needs to be updated. Commissioner Munns asked Dr. Layzell how the group planned to set the attainment goal. Dr. Layzell indicated that he and Dr. Rhoda planned to bring someone in to help them with that task. Commissioner Munns noted the need to reconcile a potential disconnect between the HESC report, which does not describe a system, and the need to set goals so that they can be linked to the public agenda.

After extensive discussion about the 2009 cluster analysis, Ms. Barton shared with the subcommittee that the state’s goal for K-12 is that by either 2030 or 2035 ninety percent (90%) of high school graduates should be college ready or job ready. Students should be able to enter college without remediation. Dr. Layzell stressed that the process should start with the education attainment goal.

Chair Love ended the discussion by stating that she will have someone present at the December CHE meeting to speak to the group about how to attain development goals and she also shared action items/necessities with the subcommittee including projections from business

community. Ms. Barton suggested that information should come from the Department of Commerce, and find out what K-12 needs from CHE.

Commissioner Munns expressed that the subcommittee needs an explicit agreement on the definition of “the system”. He suggested that the December meeting should include as an outcome a description of the system, not the goal; with a common understanding of what the system is, the attainment goal can then be developed. He stressed the need to ensure stakeholders have a shared understanding of the state’s comprehensive education system.

#### **4. Timeline Discussion**

Chair Love distributed the proposed timeline to the subcommittee and then discussed the next steps for the subcommittee. She asked members of the subcommittee to review the 2009 HESC executive summary and provide comments to Dr. Anderson by Monday, November 14, 2016. Dr. Anderson will email the *Competing for Knowledge Study* to the subcommittee members.

#### **5. Development of Public Agenda Metrics**

No discussion.

#### **6. General Discussion**

No discussion.

#### **7. Other Business**

There was no other business.

#### **8. Adjournment**

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:23 a.m.